DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 143 95 SP 008 439

AUTHOR Schmieder, Allen A.; Yarger, Sam J.
TITLE Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; University of South Florida, Tampa. Leadership Training Inst. for Educational Personnel Development.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 66p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (No price quoted)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Programs; *Program Development; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Programs

ABSTRACT

This monograph is intended to: (a) outline the background and current extent of teacher centering in the U.S., (b) stimulate intercenter communication, (c) identify resources for potential program developers, (d) raise some developmental problems and issues confronting center builders, and (e) provide a framework for a systematic analysis of the nature and promise of the teaching center concept. After a brief discussion of the problems of naming these projects, the authors identify some roots of the movement and analyze the extent and nature of teaching centers, using a survey conducted by Syracuse University. Eighteen selected summary tables from that survey are included. A typology of teaching centers identifies seven organizational types and four functional types. Five major issues for center developers are listed, followed by 25 questions arising from them. Current resources listed include 14 national programs and 46 exemplary centers. There is a 152-item bibliography. (LP)

TEACHING CENTERS: TOWARD THE STATE OF THE SCENE

by

Allen Schmieder
U.S. Office of Education

Sam J. Yarger
Syracuse University

Published by

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

and

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

and

Leadership Training Institute for Educational Personnel Development
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

November 1974

SP 008 439

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to National Education Association for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either National Education Association or the National Institute of Education.

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

This paper does not necessarily reflect the viewpoint of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). AACTE is printing this paper to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators.

The Clearinghouse is sponsored by: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); Association of Teacher Educators; Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

CONTENTS

A NOTE ABOUT THE COVER

The cover tells some things about teaching centers. Many agencies, organizations, and enterprises are involved in their conceptualization, governance, and operation. There are legal entities such as school boards and colleges (represented by rigid design elements); other teaching center components are more amorphous. The teaching center itself shows its dual nature in two ways--as part of the constellation of relationships with a fairly firm center, accompanied by surrounding operations not always clearly defined. Interrelationships in the design are multidirectional to illustrate that function determines the flow of decision making and interaction. The cover design is supposed to show fluidity of operation in a way that makes possible constructive interaction and collaborative endeavors to carry on the important task of providing sound initial and lifelong personal and professional growth.

TABLES

FOREWORD

This report on teacher centers is a joint publication of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, and the Leadership Training Institute on Educational Personnel Development (LTI) at the University of South Florida. We take pleasure in supporting the publication of this work and trust it will provide information about teacher centers in America and stimulate discussion and action that will lead to improvement in the effectiveness of the schools.

The development of teacher centers is attracting the support of those responsible for improving the quality of the schools. The past record of schools has been impressively good, but the gap between the actual and the ideal remains. The interest in teacher centers is stimulated by confidence that they may be one of the best ways to improve school performance. The primary purpose of teacher centers is to improve the instructional effectiveness of teachers, but the burden for improving the schools cannot be placed exclusively on the shoulders of the classroom teacher. Some shortcomings in the schools may be traced to the level of school funding, quality of school facilities, supply of materials and instructional aids, administrative procedures, or other factors quite apart from the competence of the teacher in the classroom. These are serious matters, because no teacher can perform at his or her best unless the conditions for effective teaching are present. However, the best of conditions will not convert the ineffectual teacher into a masterful instructor. Both elements, conditions and competence, are necessary for effective schools. The emphasis on teacher centers in this document does not intend to exclude the improvement of conditions for teachers as a major problem that needs to be solved, but the improvement of teaching is viewed as a necessary condition for school improvement.

Teacher centers will be productive if they draw on the wisdom and knowledge that relates to teaching. This knowledge is embedded in many sources. Teachers have acquired knowledge through their experience and training that should be utilized in teacher centers. The research and theoretical knowledge that faculty in colleges and universities hold provide much of the professional knowledge required for the teacher's preparation. The substance of the basic fields of study can be provided by university personnel in the various fields of systematic knowledge. Materials that support training activities and the organization of materials into effective units of activity are critical parts of a comprehensive training program. The ability to assess the strengths and weaknesses of teachers and the instruments to measure results of professional training are essential ingredients as well. From this partial list it is apparent that even though teacher centers may be for teachers and dependent on teacher decisions for control and management, effective teacher centers must rely on the resources that are available from a wide range of people and institutions.

The organizations sponsoring this publication are among those resources that have a strong desire to help make teacher centers effective.

The collaboration between centers and the institutions represented by AACTE is an evolving trend that will be most fruitful if discussion and development of this partnership can be maintained. The LTI has been particularly interested in developing protocol and training materials to assist teachers to develop diagnostic abilities and teaching skills required to act appropriately on their diagnoses. The LTI is also responsible for the coordination of federally funded teacher centers. In this latter role the LTI includes the authors of this document in its teacher center meetings--Dr. Yarger as an observer and resource person and Dr. Schmieder as a program officer of the U.S. Office of Education. The AACTE Commission on Performance-Based Teacher Education and the LTI have maintained close liaison with one another. Because of their intertwining relationships, it is a natural sponsorship for the AACTE, LTI, and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education to collaborate in sponsoring the publication of *Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene*.

Donald E. Orlosky
Director, LTI

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director, AACTE

Joost Yff
Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

November 1974

PREFACE

Of all the new concepts in American education today, the teaching center is probably the most widely accepted as having significant promise for improving the quality of instruction in our schools.

Its appeal, to a large degree, is buttressed by the fact that it is a movement that has been equally supported by government officials involved in educational reform and the college and school practitioners on the classroom firing line. The beauty of teaching centers is that rather than promoting new "fads" in education, they generally are directed at consolidating the best efforts that educators have been building and wrestling with for many years. In other words, it is one movement in which the accent is on the positive--a welcome and much needed thrust in American education.

The relatively common teaching center goals of bringing together preservice and in-service education, theory and practice, curriculum and staff development, and the real world and the ivory tower, have also led to unusual efforts on the part of frequently discordant constituencies to work together. In the Syracuse University National Teacher Center Study, for example, it was found that fully one-third of the school sites and two-thirds of the university sites analyzed were involved in some form of consortia and that better than one-third of the school sites and half of the university sites reported that they have some type of broadly representative governance board to facilitate decision making for their teaching center (see Yarger and Leonard's "A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement on American Education.")

This monograph has five major purposes: (a) to outline roughly the background and current extent of teacher centering in the U.S., (b) to stimulate intercenter communication, (c) to point the way to some resources for potential program developers, (d) to raise some developmental problems and issues confronting center builders, and (e) to provide a framework for a systematic analysis of the nature and promise of the teaching center concept.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Among all of the good people who made this publication possible, the most important are those who have pioneered the teaching center concept across the country. In their pursuit of better ways to teach and learn, they have created some of the most excitingly new approaches to education to appear in recent times. We sincerely thank them and hope that this outline of the centering movement fairly represents the good works that they have wrought.

Special thanks go to B. Othanel Smith and David Marsh, who contributed sections to the monograph; to Albert Leonard and Sharon Coyne, who played major roles in the Syracuse study--from which much of the data for this publication were derived; to Jorie Mark, who critiqued the manuscript and suggested many constructive changes; and to Amanda Clyburn and Deborah Young of the Support Programs Staff in the U.S. Office of Education, who helped compile and edit the final copy.

We greatly appreciate the support of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the Leadership Training Institute for Educational Personnel Development, two of the most influential forces in the conceptualization and development of teacher centering in the U.S. Finally, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education staff, one of the most impressive we have ever had the pleasure of working with, not only made the whole task easier than it might have been but helped turn it into an enjoyable experience.

ABSTRACT

This monograph is intended to a) outline the background and current extent of teacher centering in the U.S., b) stimulate intercenter communication, c) identify resources for potential program developers, d) raise some developmental problems and issues confronting center builders, and e) provide a framework for a systematic analysis of the nature and promise of the teaching center concept. After a brief discussion of the problems of naming the e projects, the authors identify some roots of the movement, followed by an analysis of the extent and nature of teaching centers, which is based on a survey conducted by Syracuse University and which includes 18 selected summary tables from that survey. A typology of teaching centers identifies seven organizational types and four functional types. Five major issues for center developers are listed, followed by 25 questions arising from them. Current resources listed include 14 national programs and 46 exemplary centers. There is a 152-item bibliography.

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

To expand a bibliography using ERIC, descriptors or search terms are used. To use a descriptor: (1) Look up the descriptor in the SUBJECT INDEX of monthly, semi-annual, or annual issue of Research in Education (RIE). (2) Beneath the descriptors you will find title(s) of documents. Decide which title(s) you wish to pursue. (3) Note the "ED" number beside the title. (4) Look up the "ED" number in the "DOCUMENT RESUME SECTION" of the appropriate issue of RIE. With the number you will find a summary of the document and often the document's cost in microfiche and/or hardcopy. (5) Repeat the above procedure, if desired, for other issues of RIE and for other descriptors. (6) For information about how to order ERIC documents, turn to the back pages of RIE. (7) Indexes and annotations of journal articles can be found in Current Index to Journals in Education by following the same procedure. Periodical articles cannot be secured through ERIC.

TOPIC: *Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene*

DESCRIPTORS

*Teacher Centers, *Teacher Education, *Educational Programs; *Teaching Programs; *Program Development

*Asterisk indicates major descriptor.

WHAT THE PEOPLE ARE SAYING ABOUT IT . . .

Some descriptive statements by some famous--and a few infamous--educators

"Teaching centering of one kind or another is being actively pursued in this country in thousands of different places--and probably with a much greater variety than in any other nation in the world."

"The impetus for teaching centers flows from many sources, giving the concept a relatively widespread base of support and contributing to its rapid growth."

". . . the continuum runs from very humble 'shoe string' budgets arising out of modest donations and services fees to well-financed federally supported centers."

"There is no existing mechanism for bringing the extensive and rich resources of the education world to bear directly upon the most immediate needs of teachers and students. The teaching center may be just the place to finally pull it off."

"The extent to which that potential becomes reality will be determined to a large degree by how successfully these centers can integrate diverse elements within both the profession and the community and bring them to focus on fundamental issues of school improvement."

"Placing program determination in the control of teachers is essential if the center is to respond to teacher-discerned needs."

". . . just as all other major reform efforts involving only a segment of the educational mix of 'movers and shakers' failed to make a difference, so too will teacher centers that are 'of, by, and for' teachers."

"I'm not as concerned with who controls teacher centers as with how they can best improve the instructional process."

"The basic goal may be seen as the promotion of changes in the attitudes and behavior of educational personnel (not just teachers) which result in improved learning for children."

"The teachers' centres have so much to offer only because they are nourished and sustained by the ideas and experiences of the grass-root professional."

"One of the most overworked terms appearing in the language of educators today is the word center."

"A * by any other name."

"To exist, teacher centers must continually be in the process of absorbing, adapting, changing, supporting, accepting, attracting, fusing, liberating--in short, becoming."

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

In the title of his editorial "A * by Any Other Name," in the special teaching center section of the 1974 spring issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education*, William Smith accentuated the difficulty of pinning down a proper label for what it is that educators are generally referring to when they discuss teaching centering.[1] Other writers have expressed similar difficulty; the following remarks sum up the situation:

> What shall we call them? What's in a name? With a name like mine how could I be concerned? Is it a he or a she, a hare or jack rabbit, or another Harvey? Does it really exist? Yes, just as surely as Santa Claus exists. What we call this new mechanism for personnel training is not very important. The name of a horse is not what makes him win or lose a race. But all the verbal horseplay aside, some titles may be more appropriate than others. "Training Complex" may be so tied up with the work of the last two years that associations with the name get in the way of thinking in a broader context that now seems demanded. "Teacher Center" will not satisfy those persons who see the center as a place to train administrators, supervisors, counsellors, and the like, as well as teachers. "Center for Personnel Development" has been suggested. This title has in its favor the fact that it covers all for whom training is to be provided. It is also readily understood. The designation not only names but also feebly implies what goes on there. I have no special wisdom about what to name the baby. But I do think it should be kept simple and in keeping with common terms.[2]

> Probably no other new educational concept offers up such a rich array of names and acronyms as the teaching center. The most commonly used are teacher center, teaching center, learning center, teacher education center, staff development center, educational cooperative, and training complex. Some of the more unusual are Community Clinic Learning Center, Project FAST (Federally Assisted Staff Training), Master Inservice Plan, Cooperative Prescriptive Teaching Program, Project Train, UNITE (United Neighborhoods in Teacher Education), C-Force Action Center (C for children, caring, community), Project Interact, "a place to learn," and MEIL (Movement to Encourage Improved Learning). . . .

---

1 William L. Smith, "A * by Any Other Name," Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 2.

2 From a letter dated 28 June 1971 from B. Othanel Smith to one of the authors who was at that time grappling (along with many others) with what to call a proposed program.

> [The] survey [reported by Yarger and Leonard] revealed more than 200 different titles for the 600 sites studied. This great variety is of course no accident as, with the best of American free enterprise, educators have designed programs that closely fit their own needs and local situations. In short, they are "doing their own thing."[3]

Of all the labels used, the authors prefer the term "teaching center." "Teaching" highlights the instructional function which may be performed or supported by a variety of persons--not only by teachers. Although teaching centers do have a great range of character and programs, their major purpose is more focused: to improve the quality of instruction that takes place in schools and classrooms. Although many educators would (and should) give priority to greater involvement of teachers in the problems of curriculum and staff development, the authors believe that any new system directed at staff development and educational renewal must embrace the full spectrum of educational personnel and resources. The term "teaching center" serves to keep the net of centering experience as open as possible.

---

3 Allen A. Schmieder and Sam J. Yarger, "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America," Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 5-6.

SOME ROOTS OF THE CENTER MOVEMENT

--Search for ways to link more effectively the preservice and in-service training of educational personnel

--Search for more systematic and effective in-service training of educational personnel

--Search for ways to integrate more effectively curriculum development and staff development

--Search for more effective systems of introducing preservice teachers into the schools

--Development of teacher center networks in the United Kingdom, Japan, the Netherlands, and other foreign nations

--New emphasis on continuous teacher training--from the time of career choice until retirement

--Movement toward competency-based teacher education and certification

--Search for new and more effective ways to share experiences and resources better among generally noncommunicating educational constituencies (students, teachers, administrators, supervisors, college and university staff, interested community)

--Strong advocacy by a number of important educational writers, e.g., Silberman, Bailey, James

--Support of pilot programs (especially of British model) by Ford, Carnegie, and other foundations

--Recommendation by Task Force '72 of U.S. Office of Education (USOE) that the concept is one of the five most promising new ones in teacher education.

--Positions of National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, and United Federation of Teachers, who have strongly supported the concept, developed a number of position papers on the subject, and started a number of demonstration centers.

--Legislation and/or administrative regulations that relate to the teacher center movement in the U.S. passed by approximately one-third of the states.

--National Defense Education Act/National Science Foundation institutes that focused on the improvement of in-service educational personnel, accentuated many needs regarding educational personnel development, emphasized cooperative ventures, and began to uncover some new center-like alternatives

--Laboratory schools of the 1940s and '50s that offered "field-centered" training for preservice teachers and emphasized program innovation

--State and federal legislation of the 1960s and '70s that supported national surveys (USOE, National Institute of Education--NIE); national program pilots (USOE, NIE); a great variety of state programs, e.g., pilot centers, Boards of Cooperative Educational Services; and the development of several state plans

--Need to "install" nationally developed curriculum projects built in response to the launching of Sputnik

--Organizing of the teaching profession and its increasing demand to be more in control of its own staff development programs

--Recommendation (in one form or another) by both the Teachers' and Higher Education National Field Task Forces on the Improvement and Reform of American Education that the teaching center is the best route to better staff training

--Increasing commitment of the education profession to find better ways continually to upgrade and review the qualifications of all educational personnel

--Continuing priority of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

Highlights of the Study

Location and target population. An analysis of the characteristics of the teaching center movement in American education reveals many interesting facts. Whereas school district-related programs are located more often in rural areas, university-based programs as well as the select sample programs tended to be found in urban areas (see Table 2). Centers are affiliated more often with large universities than with small ones, and a much higher percentage is associated with public institutions than with private ones (see Table 3). The higher level of external support for the select sample programs leads one to speculate that larger public institutions support such projects more often because they have the necessary resources and greater budgetary flexibility.

The great majority of the programs studied serve public school populations running the gamut from kindergarten through grade 12, but the select sample programs tended to have a grade level focus (see Table 4).

Program focus. As would be expected, program content ranges widely over a variety of topics. School district programs more frequently have a specific problem focus than do university and the select sample programs. The most common emphasis is on individualized instruction, followed by classroom management, humanizing education, open education, and skills training in developing curriculum and educational materials. In general, pedagogical programs seem to be far more popular than those associated with specific academic content.

Apparently, the primary purpose of most teaching centers is the enhancement of skills for teaching children--a focus that differentiates them from many other training programs (see Table 5).

Scheduling, incentives cost. Center activities take place much more frequently during the school year than in the summer. As one might expect, where summer programs are held they are more frequently in university-based centers where high numbers of teachers are "back in school" working on advanced degrees (see Table 7). Program activities during the school year occur most often in the late afternoon and evening--not a very desirable time from the viewpoint of most teachers.

To provide incentives, school districts most often use credit toward advanced salary status and released time to attract center participants, while universities rely heavily on college credit leading to advanced degrees, for bringing participants into their centers (see Table 8). Direct stipends are seldom available as an inducement for participation.

It is difficult to assess real participant costs for involvement in teaching center activities. In the university and select sample programs, the primary expenses expectedly, are those related to tuition fees (see Table 9). Participants are also usually expected to assume the cost for items such as transportation, food, and babysitting.

Of all the costs, the one that teachers generally find most distasteful is that of time. With few exceptions, center activities are scheduled after the "regular" working day and cut into the personal time of the people they are designed to serve. It would be helpful to study the various approaches employed by those centers that have been able to schedule their main programs during the regular school day. It is a reasonable guess that this issue will become more significant in the future, especially as teachers' associations argue in favor of more released time during the regular working day to enable teachers to participate actively in center activities. The situation is best summarized in the report of a national cross-section of classroom teachers who met at Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, under the auspices of Task Force '72:

> Teachers . . . are most desirous of change, of leadership, of new and better ways to serve the children they teach. . . . it is not change which disturbs them. It is expectations unfulfilled; it is being asked to deliver excellence in education without adequate training . . . support . . . time and money . . . and opportunities for personal growth and development.[5]

Center clients. As one might expect, in-service teachers are the most frequent clients of teaching centers, with administrators second. The select sample programs were often directed at community participants and paraprofessionals, but these two groups were rarely included in the other kinds of centers (see Table 10). This, again, might be a result of the high incidence of federal and other kinds of outside support in this category, as the guidelines for such support often require broad-based participation. One of the most interesting findings to emerge from this section of the data was that certain groups for whom programs are designed frequently do not take advantage of them. This phenomenon seems to be most common with preservice trainees and administrators.

Evaluation. Despite the increasing emphasis in American education on accountability and evaluation, there does not appear to be much activity in that area in the teacher center movement. To be fair, it should be pointed out that this condition is relatively common for most educational programs. Clearly, the most typical form of evaluation used in the centers studied is that based upon the perceptions and opinions of program staff as well as of participants (see Table 11). The use of sophisticated

5 Philip Woodruff, "Task Force '72 and the Classroom Teacher Look at Educational Reform" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, 1972), p.17.

measurement instruments for program evaluation purposes is infrequent, and the great majority of teaching centers rarely, if ever, use assessment information for the individual evaluation of educational personnel. Although the survey did not look deeply into the matter, when program materials are selected little attention is given to the degree of validation regarding their potential effectiveness.

Although it is not surprising given the recency of the teacher center movement, most centers surveyed do not have their own permanent facilities. (see Table 12). In school systems, less than 15 percent have a regular facility designated for their program, with the percentage jumping to approximately 30 percent in universities and exactly 50 percent within the select sample. The less frequent existence of permanent facilities within the school system sample may be due to fact that school systems typically have large physical plants which they are expected to use economically. The high incidence of separate facilities in the select sample partly reflects the fact that most of the independent centers are in this category and that because of their focus on open education and their use of abundant "rough" resources (e.g., refrigerator boxes and telephone wire), their developers have worked especially hard to obtain large, private facilities for their use. Many students of the teaching center concept feel that no facility may be the best kind of place to practice centering--a view that requires the practitioner to focus on the process and to transport the program to wherever the need happens to be most urgent.

Governance and staffing. One of the most encouraging findings of the entire survey is that collaborative efforts in program development are already widespread within the teaching center movement. This is surprising in that both teaching centers and the concept of inter-institutional collaboration are relatively recent phenomena on the educational scene. The most common type of consortium relationship exists as a partnership between a school district and a university (see Table 13). A great number of these relationships carry either legally binding or at least formally written agreements.

Another important fact that emerged is that a large number of teaching center and teaching center-like programs have their own governance boards (see Tables 14 and 15). Although the majority of these boards are viewed as being advisory in nature, a substantial minority are viewed as policy makers. Teachers and administrators are the most frequent members of these governance boards, but a significant minority of boards include both students and community representatives (see Table 16).

Teaching center programs are usually operated by "part-timers." This is probably due to the newness of the phenomenon, the relative scarcity of dollars for training, and the fact that teaching centers have, in many cases, not yet been institutionalized. The part-timers usually identified themselves as relatively high-status administrators.

This is important because, while policy is frequently set by a formalized governance board, decisions about program content are most often made by administrators or small committees of administrators and teachers.

If administrators of teaching centers are "part-timers," the personnel who develop and implement the programs are even more so--averaging less than 25 percent of their professional time on center activities. Regardless of their rank, these program personnel are usually selected on the basis of specific skills, either content or process, as well as on the recommendations of their peers and administrators.

This "part-time" characteristic of teaching centers and the higher status of participants may augur well for institutionalization. Instead of requiring new administrative machinery and personnel, which would add to the current fragmentation of programs in schools and universities, it looks like teaching centers--even with all of their great variety of potential new mixes of personnel and institutions--could become part of the "regular" educational structure from their outset.

Financing. Although the financial data gathered in the Syracuse study has marked limitations, certain generalizations seem justified. First, and perhaps most important, is that in relationship to the total money spent on American education, a relatively small percentage is devoted to programs for professional development (see Table 17). These data were corroborated by a recent national survey that showed that in 180 school districts an average of less than one-half of one percent of education dollars are spent on in-service training.[6] Another study indicated that only about one-fourth of the states spend any state funds on the improvement of in-service education. It was also clear from the Syracuse survey that a high percentage of the larger centers are supported by outside funding agencies (see Table 18). Perhaps teaching centers are still seen as a luxury by local school boards, or perhaps educators still operate under the illusion that once a teacher has a baccalaureate degree and an initial state certificate, the training has been completed. But the fact that teaching centers continue to exist, even with minimal funding, may reflect the strong desire of many administrators, teachers, and community members to reallocate existing resources to purposes they see as being important.

Another point worthy of note is that smaller school systems, for one reason or another, are less involved in teaching centers than larger school systems are. This fact may well be related to the greater access larger school systems have to external sources of support. However, one could speculate that smaller school systems would in many ways be more

6 Michael Van Ryan and Mary Van Ryan, Survey of Inservice Education (Albany: New York State Department of Education, 1974).

appropriate developers of "pathfinder" programs, for it is a well-established finding that change and reform are more difficult in the larger bureaucratic structures. But the need for effective staff development is obviously great in the larger school systems, and the fact that teacher centering is happening in them is significant.

Finally, the teaching center movement in American education is apparently being promoted to a large degree with external funds. This should not be too suprising when one analyzes recent thrusts in the U.S. Office of Education toward programs for the improvement of educational personnel. But this situation should serve to warn program developers that in some cases externally supported programs have a history of becoming extinct as external funds dry up. It is hoped that sufficient public acceptance of the teaching center concept can be generated to preclude this phenomenon. It is similarly important, however, that one be aware of the impact that external funds--no matter their short and tenuous lifespan--have had on the growth of the teaching center movement. One can argue quite convincingly against critics of the use of external funds that the initiation of significant programs in this area might not otherwise have occurred. Teaching centers are by no means the first promising educational reform strategy to be launched with "outside" funds--nor probably the last.

Conclusion

The most important conclusion from the Syracuse study is that teacher centering is happening and on a relatively large scale. In one form or another, "centering" is occurring day to day in virtually every state in the union. Often, it is hard to find, frequently it is not called "teacher centering," and sometimes what is happening is not even very good. The fact remains, however, that a large number of American educators view the need for continual staff development of educational personnel as being very important.

It is hoped that the information presented in this summary and in the tables that follow will serve at least two purposes: (a) to provide information that will help program developers plan better teaching center programs and (b) to generate new, more intensive, and much needed studies on the nature and promise of programs for the professional development of educational personnel.

The teaching center movement in American education is in its infancy, yet, unlike many other movements, it appears to be flexible enough to accomodate nearly any educational orientation and has the general support of nearly all major educational constituencies needed to make it work. As the movement grows, it is hoped that the primary focus will be on searching out the best ways in which centers can improve the teaching-learning processes. In the final analysis, although most places and programs are called "teaching centers" or "teacher centers," they will be judged by their impact on the learning of children.

Selected Summary Tables from the Syracuse National Teacher Center Survey

TABLE 1: POPULATION SIZE, SAMPLE SIZE, AND RATE OF RESPONSE

Population label	Population size	Sample size	Number of questionnaires returned and percentage of sample	Returned questionnaire as a percentage of population
School systems	11,200	1,119 (10%)	272 (24.3%)	2.28%
Universities/ colleges	856	571 (67%)	224 (39.2%)	24.3%
Select	N.A.	203 (N.A.)	102 (50.2%)	N.A.

TABLE 2: SIZE OF COMMUNITY WHERE TEACHING CENTERS ARE LOCATED

	Sample		
	School (%)	University (%)	Select (%)
Rural or town with less than 50,000 population	80.4	51.2	32.3
Town with population greater than 50,000	5.5	41.0	55.7
Suburb of larger city	14.1	7.8	11.1
Total of those responding	100.0	100.0	99.1

TABLE 3:

VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE RESPONDENTS

		Sample	
		University (%)	Select (%)
Public		58.0	80.4
Private		42.0	19.6
Size of enrollment of university or college	Less than 1,000	16.9	6.3
	1,000-10,000	60.7	43.8
	Greater than 10,000	22.4	50.1
Educational component within university or college	School or college	46.5	66.7
	Smaller unit	53.5	33.5
Graduate education enrollment of university or college	0	15.0	0.0
	Less than 500	41.0	40.9
	Greater than 500	44.3	59.1
Undergraduate education enrollment of university or college	0	1.3	2.8
	Less than 500	44.8	19.4
	Greater than 500	53.9	77.8

TABLE 4:

VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT RESPONDENTS

	Sample	
	School (%)	Select (%)
Number of children served		
Less than 500	17.1	2.1
500 to 5,000	61.1	20.8
Greater than 5,000	21.8	77.1
Grade levels served		
K-12	75.6	50.0
Other	24.4	50.0

TABLE 5: PURPOSES OF TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
Enhancement of skills for teaching children	88.8	--	88.5	--	86.5	--
Enhancement of skills for curriculum and material development	61.7	36.0 (S)	54.0	41.0 (S)	56.9	41.5 (S)
Focus on other professional areas, e.g., self-improvement, certification, labor negotiation, human relations	19.4	49.6 (S) 27.0 (R)	22.7	54.4 (S)	21.3	46.8 (S) 25.5 (R)
Recreational or social needs	4.5	42.8 (R) 42.3 (N)	5.4	46.1 (R) 34.7 (N)	6.6	46.2 (R) 38.5 (N)

Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.

TABLE 6: TASKS PERFORMED BY PERSONNEL IN TEACHING CENTERS

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
Teach class	33.0	26.8 (S) 25.8 (R)	75.7	20.2 (S)	40.3	35.4 (S)
Conduct workshops	29.3	50.2 (S)	41.4	54.7 (S)	51.1	41.3 (S)
Consult individually with clients	18.2	50.8 (S) 22.8 (R)	48.8	41.9 (S)	51.1	42.4 (S)
Perform classroom observations	26.4	50.9 (S)	35.5	51.5 (S)	34.1	44.0 (S)
Evaluate programs	43.5	43.5 (S)	37.9	44.8 (S)	31.9	49.5 (S)
Evaluate client performance	29.2	35.6 (S) 20.8 (R)	38.0	39.8 (S)	27.5	37.9 (S)
Develop program materials and activities	45.4	42.1 (S)	44.5	44.0 (S)	55.3	37.2 (S)
Other	25.0	58.3 (N)	36.4	27.3 (S) 36.4 (N)	91.0	0.0 (R) 0.0 (N)

Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.

TABLE 7: TIME PERIOD OF YEAR, WEEK, AND DAY WHEN PROGRAM ACTIVITIES ARE SCHEDULED IN TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
During the academic or school year	90.1	--	87.5	--	86.2	--
During the summer months	10.3	43.0 (S) 28.7 (R)	37.9	43.2 (S)	31.8	55.7 (S)
During school hours	31.7	43.5 (S)	36.6	33.7 (S) 21.7 (R)	27.8	44.4 (S) 22.2 (R)
Late afternoons and evenings	39.1	40.4 (S)	46.0	43.0 (S)	55.3	34.0 (S)
On weekends	1.4	36.7 (R) 40.8 (N)	3.5	35.7 (S) 31.0 (R) 29.8 (N)	14.6	28.1 (S) 38.2 (R)

Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.

TABLE 8: INCENTIVES FOR PARTICIPATION IN TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
Local credit toward salary increment	29.3	23.4 (S) 36.0 (N)	43.6	26.7 (S)	45.4	30.2 (S)
University or college credit	20.2	40.4 (S) 26.6 (N)	71.2	--	55.0	27.5 (S)
Direct stipend	7.5	22.8 (S) 20.9 (R) 48.8 (N)	9.3	41.6 (R) 28.0 (N)	10.3	36.8 (R) 34.5 (N)
Released time from regular responsibilities	32.5	41.0 (S)	14.3	32.1 (S) 35.1 (R)	21.1	47.8 (S)
No incentive	19.1	23.1 (R) 41.2 (N)	12.8[a]	30.4 (R) 43.9 (N)	16.4	26.0 (R) 39.7 (N)

[a] Only 71.8% of the university sample responded to this item.
Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.

TABLE 9: COSTS TO PARTICIPANTS FOR INVOLVEMENT IN TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
Pay tuition or instructional fee	10.1	27.8 (S) 19.8 (R) 42.3 (N)	61.0	--	28.9	28.9 (S) 30.0 (N)
Pay for materials used in program	15.2	20.3 (S) 27.7 (R) 36.8 (N)	33.5	31.7 (S) 17.1 (R) 17.7 (N)	18.0	22.5 (S) 37.1 (R) 22.5 (N)
Give up personal time without compensation	25.3	39.7 (S) 21.9 (R)	42.0	33.7 (S)	37.8	43.3 (S)
Assume responsibilities for personal expenses (e.g., babysitter, meals, mileage)	37.0	25.3 (S)	66.0	--	62.7	--

Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.

TABLE 10: ROLE GROUPS OF CLIENTS FOR WHOM TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS ARE DESIGNED

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
In-service teachers	92.3	--	71.9	23.2 (S)	85.3	
Preservice teachers	18.2	34.8 (S) 23.5 (R) 23.5 (N)	58.4	25.8 (S)	50.0	33.7 (S)
Administrators	36.6	42.9 (S)	24.1	47.6 (S)	35.5	51.1 (S)
Paraprofessionals	18.1	45.0 (S)	13.9	34.5 (S) 29.7 (R) 21.8 (N)	25.8	45.2 (S)
Community participants and/or parents	4.5	43.2 (S) 37.7 (R)	5.5	30.3 (S) 41.2 (R) 23.0 (N)	16.9	44.9 (S) 27.0 (R)

Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.

TABLE 11: EVALUATION METHODS USED IN TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
By standardized instruments	5.5	44.5 (N)	16.2	32.3 (S) 34.2 (R)	12.6	26.4 (S) 29.9 (R) 31.0 (N)
By perceptions and opinions of program participants	70.3	25.9 (S)	65.4	31.8 (S)	74.4	21.3 (S)
By perceptions and opinions of program implementers and administrators	52.6	40.9 (S)	61.3	32.9 (S)	61.3	26.9 (S)
By an external agent or consultant	7.5	25.8 (S) 33.8 (R) 32.9 (N)	3.8	33.3 (S) 30.2 (R) 32.7 (N)	13.5	29.2 (S) 33.7 (R) 23.6 (N)

Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.

TABLE 12: PROGRAM FACILITIES USED TO HOUSE TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS*

	Sample					
	School (%)		University (%)		Select (%)	
	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses	Respondents in either the Always or Usually category	Other notable responses
School district central office or instructional center	23.7	40.9 (S)	16.0	42.9 (S)	22.9	41.0 (S) 24.1 (R)
Elementary or secondary schools	69.2	29.5 (S)	43.3	43.4 (S)	50.6	44.0 (S)
University or college campus	3.0	36.8 (S) 34.3 (R)	39.8	45.6 (S)	15.8	47.6 (S) 23.2 (R)
Not owned by school system or university/college	2.1[a]	30.6 (R) 51.8 (N)	4.2[b]	36.1 (R) 45.1 (N)	12.6	31.3 (R) 41.2 (N)

[a] Only 74.2% of respondents responded to this question.
[b] Only 69.9% of respondents responded to this question.
Note: S=Sometimes; R=Rarely; N=Never.
*14.4% of school centers have permanent facilities, 30.9% of university centers and 50% of select sample centers.

TABLE 13: INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN TEACHING CENTER CONSORTIUMS

Make-up of consortia	Sample		
	School (%)	University (%)	Select (%)
Public school plus university/college	33.0	36.8	41.7
Public school, university/college, plus other educational agency (SED, BOCES, etc.)	14.3	23.7	30.6
Public school, university/college, other educational agency, plus other noneducational agency	4.4	6.1	6.9

TABLE 14: ROLE OF GOVERNANCE BOARD IN TEACHING CENTERS

	Sample		
	School (%)	University (%)	Select (%)
Advisory only	51.0	50.2	44.6
Policy-making	20.0	52.6	50.8
Administrative, implementative (deals with routine day-to-day decisions)	21.0	7.2	4.6

TABLE 15: LOCUS OF DECISION MAKING IN TEACHING CENTERS

	Sample		
	School (%)	University (%)	Select (%)
Director, other administrator, or administrative committee	29.6	36.0	27.8
Committee of teachers as well as administrators	58.3	29.1	25.6
Committee including others, e.g., students, community representatives	3.7	24.9	22.2
Others including various combinations of the three above	8.4	10.0	24.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 16: ROLE GROUPS REPRESENTED ON BOARDS OF TEACHING CENTERS

	Sample		
	School (%)	University (%)	Select (%)
Institutional administrators only	6.2	10.8	14.1
Administrators and teachers	37.1	14.0	10.9
Teachers only	4.1	--	6.3
Administrators, teachers, and teachers association representatives	11.3	11.8	6.3
Various other combinations including above roles plus students, student teachers, parents, and/or community agency representatives	41.3	63.4	62.4

TABLE 17: RANGE AND MEAN OF INSTITUTIONAL BUDGETS USED TO SUPPORT TEACHING CENTER PROGRAMS AND RELATIONSHIP TO TOTAL BUDGET

	School system centers	Higher Education Centers	Select school system centers	Select higher education centers
A. Sum of institutional budgets	$838,815,860	$86,565,259	$515,358,960	$33,711,000
Number of institutional budgets	180	76	21	23
B. Sum of amount used for teacher center-like programs	$3,701,588	$6,047,978	$2,569,135	$4,030,298
Range	$0-500,000	$0-860,000	$1,000-835,635	$2,000-1,000,000
Mean	$20,654	$79,578	$122,339	$175,230
C. Percentage B of A	0.44	6.98	0.49	11.95

TABLE 18:

DEGREE OF EXTERNAL SUPPORT FOR A SELECT SAMPLE OF TEACHING CENTERS

Sample	Number of reporting institutions	Number reporting some external support	Percentage	Source of external support
School	180	58	32.2	52 Public agency 1 Private agency 5 Both
Institution of higher education	76	36	47.1	25 Public agency 2 Private agency 9 Both
Select school	21	16	76.2	11 Public agency 0 Private agency 5 Both
Select institution of higher education	23	14	60.9	10 Public agency 1 Private agency 3 Both

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF TEACHING CENTERS

When the term "teaching center" is mentioned in the U.S., it could just as well refer to three teachers opening a store-front shop in Harlem, as to a state-controlled network of centers designed to serve literally thousands of teachers and other educational personnel. If we are going to understand and communicate about teaching centers in the U.S., we need to develop an explanatory system that makes it possible to describe more accurately the way centers are organized and function.

American educational programs often have multiple sources of administrative and financial support, complicated governance mechanisms, and unique types of relationships with other institutions and agencies. This complexity, coupled with the diversity of teaching center activities, makes the problems of comprehending and communicating what a teaching center is even more difficult. The brief typology of their organization and functions presented here is intended to minimize at least some of the confusion and to make it possible for educators to examine more systematically teacher centering in America.

Organizational Types

There are seven organizational types of teaching centers:

Independent teaching center. This type of center is characterized by the absence of any formal affiliation with an established institution. Most existing prototypes are supported by private foundations. Without bureaucratic red tape, program directors and implementers have unusual freedom and flexibility. They also, however, lack the financial security that bureaucracy often provides. Teachers become involved with this type of center on a purely voluntary basis; so the center tends to have high teacher credibility. Independent teaching centers deal typically with individual teacher needs rather than with complex institutional concerns. Examples: Teachers, Inc.; The Teacher Works.*

"Almost" independent teaching center. An "almost" independent center is not independent, it just thinks it is. Although formally linked with an educational institution (either a college or school system), a high amount of autonomy is evident. This autonomy is usually linked to the charisma or influence of the program personnel. As is the case with the independent center, involvement is voluntary, and the emphasis is on the perceived needs of either the clients or the program leaders rather than on institutional goals. Although the center is subject to some

* Although the authors recognize that no teaching center is "pure" in its organization or function, they offer these centers as the best examples of these types. Complete addresses are on pages 38-41.

degree of institutional pressure, the ability to remain autonomous is its distinguishing factor. Examples: Workshop Center for Open Education; Teachers' Learning Center.

Professional organization teaching center. There are two basic kinds of professional organization centers: the "negotiated" teacher association center and the "subject area" (e.g., social studies) center. The former emerges from the formal bargaining procedures within a school system, while the latter usually comes out of the concerns of a particular subject-focused organization and has many of the characteristics of the independent center. Although both are rare in American education, the negotiated center tends to focus on professional as well as educational problems, while the subject center usually emphasizes a particular high-priority classroom subject. In either case, the related professional organization is the dominant force in the governance structure. Examples: Scarsdale Teaching Institute; Boise Public Schools Teacher Center.

Single unit teaching center. Probably the most common type of American center, the single unit teaching center is characterized by its association with and administration by a single educational institution. Although difficult to distinguish from conventional in-service programs, the center typically has greater organization, more sophisticated programs, and more thoroughly developed institutional goals. Little parity exists, and accountability is the exclusive province of the institutional administration. External resources and funds are often used, but they are always institutionally administered. Program development in this type of center is closely tied to approved institutional goals. Examples: Teacher Education Renewal Program; North Dallas Teacher Education Center.

Free partnership teaching center. This type of center represents the simplest form of those based on the concept of a consortium. Usually, the partnership involves a school system and a university or college. It could, however, involve two school systems, two universities, or even a noneducational agency. The popularity of the partnership suggests that a two-party relationship is easier to initiate and maintain than a consortium involving three or more institutions. The word "free" refers to the fact that the partnership is entered into willingly, rather than being prescribed legislatively or politically. Program development will show evidence of attempts to accommodate the needs and goals of both partners. This type of center often evolves from a single unit center in which a good relationship develops between the sponsoring unit and consultants from other nearby educational institutions. Examples: Syracuse University--West Genessee Teaching Center; Minneapolis Teacher Center.

Free consortium teaching center. Characterized by three or more institutions willingly entering into a teaching center relationship, the organization, commitments, and policy considerations will usually be more complex and formal than in a free partnership. Financial arrangements

are also more complex, with external sources of support frequently being the primary catalyst for creating the consortium. Program development tends to be more general, because the goals and constraints of each party must be taken into account. The continuation of this type of center is often related to the ability of member institutions and their constituencies to see merit in the programs. "First phase" development usually takes much longer than with most other types of centers because of the need for building trust among a complex mix of participants, but the long-range payoff and potential large-scale impact often make the early spider dances worthwhile. Examples: Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service; Houston Teacher Center.

Legislative/political consortium teaching center. This type of center is characterized by an organization and constituency prescribed either by legislative mandate or by political influence. Often, but not always, the state education agency oversees the process. In a sense, it is a forced consortium. Although participation by eligible institutions tends to be quite varied, it is not unusual for a financial incentive to exist as an enticement. A rather complex communications system is frequently used to assist the administering agency in program development. Although this type of center is frequently organized on the basis of county boundaries, the organization may range from subcounty to a total state model. In some cases, the responsibility for "in-service education days" is moved from the school system to the center. In several states it has also been proposed that this type of center should become the institution which recommends candidates for professional teaching certificates. Examples: Rhode Island Teacher Center; Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems.

Functional Types

There are four functional types of teaching centers:

Facilitating teaching center. Joyce and Weil describe this as the informal "English" type of teaching center. In their words, it is a center "which exists much more in the hortatory literature than in real-world exemplars. It is used to create an environment in which teachers explore curriculum materials and help each other think out approaches to teaching. . . . Such a center seeks to improve cooperative activities among teachers."[7] This type of center provides an atmosphere that will allow the teacher to explore new ideas and techniques either through direct interaction with other teachers or via "hands-on" experience with new curriculum materials. No specific program is offered, and professional growth is a function of the unique needs and initiatives of the individuals who voluntarily come to the center. Quite simply, it is intended to facilitate a teacher's personal and professional development. It serves a heuristic, "colleagueal," almost social educational function. Examples: The Greater Boston Teacher Center; Advisory and Learning Exchange.

7 Bruce R. Joyce and Marsha Weil, Concepts of Teacher Centers (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May 1973), p. 7.

Advocacy teaching center. An advocacy type of teaching center is characterized by a particular philosophical or programmatic commitment. Although usually explicit, the advocacy may simply be the result of committed professionals with common beliefs joining together in the same teaching center. Advocacy centers may provide concepts such as open education, competency-based education, differentiated staffing, multi-unit schools, and so on. The key element is that the teaching center has a visible thrust and is committed to a particular philosophy, orientation, or educational movement. This type of center is usually limited to a single educational orientation, such as open education. Examples: Project Change; College of Education Teacher Center.

Responsive teaching center. Education in the U.S. appears to foster at least two kinds of responsive centers. The first attempts to respond to the specific needs of individual educators, while the second focuses on specified institutional needs. They are likely to exist in very different organizational structures. In both cases, however, there is an implied needs assessment and a commitment to develop a program in accordance with mutually derived objectives. Rather than promoting any particular concept or philosophy of education, this kind of center is designed to help a potential client better understand his needs and then to provide resources and/or training designed to fill those needs. Programming is usually diverse, with heavy reliance on external resources. Examples: Kanawha County Teacher Center; Appalachian Training Complex.

Functionally unique teaching center. Some teaching centers are designed to serve rather limited, unique functions. These may include materials development, research, and/or field testing of available materials. In some cases, a teaching center may have developed from a program that originally had a totally different purpose. For example, suppose an experimental classroom in a single school is set up to provide service to a particular kind of child. As its popularity grows, teachers visit it with increasing regularity to see the materials, observe the instructional techniques, and solicit counsel from the teacher. In this case, the resulting teaching center is more directly child centered than most. In fact, program personnel would likely have to make many changes in order to accomodate the new, unique teaching center function. Examples: Appalachian Teacher Center; Children's Museum.

In any attempt to use a tool such as this typology for program analysis, it must be kept in mind that the teaching centers in this nation--both real and planned--are neither pure nor consistent. However, at least three reasonable purposes are served by such an imperfect tool. First, and of most immediate importance, the typology can be used as a basis for more systematic communication about and analysis of American teaching centers. Interestingly, up to this time professional educators have conversed about teacher and teaching centers with little, if any, communication taking place, because they were talking in different languages with different concepts in mind. As data become available, and as the concepts become less murky, communication will become more precise. Until that time, this tool is offered as a starting point.

A heuristic function may also be served. The typology may be used as a conceptual tool to determine significant attributes and to initiate logically based research in an effort to define more adequately the various concepts of teaching centers. Subsequently, relationships can be determined between the various organizational structures and the functions served. The importance of this research base for the intelligent development of teaching center programs cannot be overstressed. Although this typology was based on a great deal of descriptive information and personal experiences, it was generated deductively and its degree of usefulness needs to be tested.

Finally, and of the greatest long-range importance, as reliable information is being produced and analyzed, instruments and techniques can be developed to help program designers build the kind of teaching center programs that most closely relate to specific situational needs. We envision the development of needs assessment packages, consultative services, and clearinghouses of information that will be uniquely designed for teaching centers and will provide potential users with much of the necessary resources to initiate and develop a functional as well as economical teaching center program. Only through this kind of systematic effort can we begin to deal effectively with the immense task of developing and delivering the quality professional development programs so clearly needed in our educational institutions.

SOME ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR TEACHING CENTER DEVELOPERS

Some Issues--An Organizing Outline*

I. The Need Underlying Teacher Centers
This section is concerned with the needs Teacher Centers are responding to--with their justification or rationale.

A. Social/Economic/Historical Perspective of Need
--social trends imply the need for Teacher Centers

B. Educational Practice Perspective of Need
--desirable new educational purposes imply need for Teacher Centers
--educational practice in other countries suggests the viability of Teacher Centers.

C. Political Perspective of Need
--political trends are forcing educational practice to change, implying a need for Teacher Centers (ex.: the creation of NIE or the increasing demand for accountability in schools)

D. Institutional Perspective of Need
--the need for institutional renewal in education implies the desirability of Teacher Centers

II. The Focus of Teacher Centers
This section is concerned with the principle functions of a Teacher Center.

A. Teacher Education Focus (only teacher training)
--inservice, pre-service and related functions such as certification

B. Local Educational Renewal Focus
--teacher training is part of effort to help schools rethink educational goals, evaluate current procedures and success, upgrade the curriculum or administrative practice, etc.

C. Education R & D Focus
--the Teacher Center is a diffusion/dissemination system for education research and development

*This section is adapted from David Marsh's "An Explication of Issues surrounding Teacher Centers and Educational Renewal Sites," prepared for the Leadership Training Institute for Educational Personnel Development, University of South Florida, 1972.

III. The Structure of Teacher Centers

A. The Nature of the Institutional Structure
--relatively separate identity *or* special set of relationships, linkages and interfaces among existing educational and community resources
--physical setting
--possible networks of Teacher Centers

B. The Nature of Joint Responsibility
--parity/shared responsibility/designed interdependence. The possible roles each cooperating "institution" can play
--the informality or formality of the cooperative agreement, legal issues
--institutional sovereignty

C. Setting Up and Maintaining the Teacher Center
Suggestive Analogies for the Structure of Teacher Centers
--the county agriculture agent
--the teaching hospital

D. Staffing the Center
--numbers of staff, qualification, credibility
--training of Center staff

IV. The Program of Teacher Centers

A. Training Models
--alternative training models
--problems of credentials
--relationship of training to career ladders, advancement

B. Training Materials
--locus of their development
--the adaption process
--availability to teachers

V. The Financing of Teacher Centers

A. Obtaining Resources
--redirecting existing resources
--generating new resources
--the concept of mutually benefiting resources (ex.: student teacher supervisors are able to help with curriculum development because of the concentration of student teachers)

B. Coordination of Resources
--at local level or across a state, region

C. Estimating the Costs of a Teacher Center (by function, scope, etc.)

VI. The Generalizability of Teacher Centers

A. Variations between States

B. Complimentary Centers within a State

C. Unique, High Resource Centers vs. Including All Schools in a District Area, or State

VII. The Viability of Teacher Centers

A. Evaluation
--locally, across state, nationally

B. Accountability

C. Renewal over time

D. Maintaining National Leadership
--policy setting
--intellectual leadership

Some Questions

1. What is it that teaching centers can do that cannot now be done through existing structures and institutions?

2. What should the target population of teaching centers be? Teachers? Administrators? College professors? Lay persons? Paraprofessionals?

3. How much of the spectrum of training should a teaching center include? Preservice? In-service? Continuing education?

4. How large a target population should a teaching center serve? Single school? School system? College? Region? State?

5. What is the array of teaching center models already available for study by program developers?

6. How much variation of center types and programs would be ideal within a given service area?

7. Where should teaching centers be located? In a school? At a college? In neutral territory? No single physical location?

8. Who should control teaching centers? Teachers? Administrators? College faculty? School boards? An independent director? A representative council?

9. Should the training programs of teaching centers take place in actual classrooms with children?

10. What are the best incentives for teaching center participation? Released time? Stipends? Credit?

11. What are the best ways to develop center programs based upon successful teacher experiences?

12. How much "action research" should be done as part of a teaching center program?

13. Who should conduct the research component of teaching center programs?

14. How can colleges that give major emphasis to research provide other than research services to teaching centers?

15. What is the relationship between the teaching center concept and other educational innovations, e.g., competency-based education, alternative curricula, protocol and training materials, new careers?

16. What should the relationship be between teaching centers and the certification of educational personnel?

17. What should the relationship be between teaching centers and regular in-service training programs?

18. What should the relationship be between the teaching center and the training of student teachers?

19. What kind of delivery systems--local, state, and national--can be developed to channel new ideas and methods into and out of teaching centers?

20. How can validated instructional materials developed at the national and state levels be best adapted by local teaching centers?

21. What kinds of intercenter networks need to be developed? Information clearinghouse? Exemplary centers? Centers with similar purposes?

22. Are there some existing networks that teaching centers should be systematically related to, e.g. ERIC, educational television, Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations (PLATO).

23. How should teaching centers be financed? By the federal government? State government? Local governments? Professional assocations? Consortia? Foundations or other private organizations?

24. What percentage of the school budget should be used for staff development? Less than 1% (current situation)? 3%? 7%?

25. What kinds of evaluation processes and procedures should be used for teaching center programs?

SOME CURRENT RESOURCES

National Programs

American Federation of Teachers, Office of Research and Development, 1012 Fourteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (Robert Bhaerman) Tel. (202) 737-6141

The Collaborative of Advisories and Teacher Centers, Education Development Center, 55 Channel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160 (Stanley R. Wachs) Tel. (617) 969-7100.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 616, Washington, D.C. 20036 (Lorraine Poliakoff) Tel. (202) 293-7280

Leadership Training Institute on Educational Personnel Development, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620 (Donald Orlosky) Tel. (813) 974-2957

Ministry of Education, Teacher Prefecture Education Center, Tokyo, Japan

National Education Association, Instruction and Professional Development, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Dave Darland) Tel. (202) 833-4000 Ex. 5422

National Institute of Education, Priority on Local Problem Solving, Washington, D.C. 20208 (Saul Yanofsky) Tel. (202) 254-9498

National Portal Schools Program (and the Council of Great City Schools), College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601 (Gilbert Shearron) Tel. (404) 542-4244

National Teacher Center Study (NIE), Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Information Products Division, San Francisco, California 94103 (Kathleen DuVaney) Tel. (415) 565-3000

Schools Council (of the United Kingdom), 160 Great Portland Street, London, England WIN. 6LL (Gordon Hamflett)

Syracuse National Teacher Center Project, School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210 (Sam J. Yarger) Tel. (315) 423-3026

United Federation of Teachers, 260 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10010 (Eugenia Kimble) Tel. (212) 777-7500

U.S. Office of Education, Division of Educational Systems Development, Support Programs, Washington, D.C. 20202 (Allen Schmieder, Jorie Mark) Tel. (202) 245-2235

U.S. Office of Education Teacher Center Project, Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903 (Malcolm Provos) Tel. (804) 924-7163

Some Exemplary Centers*

Advisory and Learning Exchange
2000 L Street, N.W. #205
Washington, D.C. 20036
Olive Covington

Advisory for Open Education
90 Sherman Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140
Allen Leitman/Judy Albaum

Appalachian Teacher Center
690 FTA, College of Human Resources
University of West Virginia
Morgantown, West Virginia 26505
Paul Devore

Appalachian Training Complex
College of Education
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28607
John Reynolds

Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Charles K. Franzen

Baltimore Urban Teacher Education Center
23 and Calvert Street
Baltimore, Md. 21218
Charles Brown

Bay Area Teacher Center
Administration Building
1025 2nd Avenue
Oakland, California 94606
John Favors

Boise Public School Teacher Center
Boise, Idaho 83707

The Children's Museum
Jamaicaway
Boston, Massachusetts 02130
Bruce McDonald

Cleveland Area Center for Educational Personnel Development
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
James Tanner

College of Education Teacher Center
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606
Richard Hersh

* This list includes centers that are familiar to the authors. The Syracuse National Survey makes it clear that there are many more centers than the ones listed here--and some of them may be among the best. If you are related to one of the "missing," please write to the authors so that your centering experiences and publications can be shared with others interested in teaching centers. Address correspondence to Dr. Allen Schmieder, U.S. Office of Education, ROB #3, Room 3052, Washington, D.C. 20202 or to Dr. Sam J. Yarger, Associate Professor, School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

Colorado State Department of
Education
201 E. Colfay
Denver, Colorado 81301
Robert Meisenholder

Creative Teaching Workshop
45 Suffolk Street
New York, New York 10002
Floyd Page/Marion Greenwood

Durham School Learning Center Project
16th & Lombard Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19146
Lore Rasmussen

EDC--Follow Through Project
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02160
George E. Hain

The Educational Improvement
Center
South Jersey Region
Box 426
Glassboro-Woodbury Road
Pitman, New Jersey 08071

Elementary Education Teacher
Center Network
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Nicholas De Figio

The Greater Boston Teachers Center
131 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Edward Yeomans

Houston Teacher Center
College of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004
Robert Houston

Isabella Wyche School Center
206 S. Poplar Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202
Julia Saunders

Kanawha County Teacher Center
200 Elizabeth Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25311
Kathryn Maddox

Minneapolis Teacher Center
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Fred Hayen

Model Teacher Center
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207
E. Dean Anderson

North Dallas Teacher Education Center
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

A Place To Learn
Waterman Building
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont 05401
Dean Corrigan

Project Change
College of Education
SUNY at Cortland
Cortland, New York 13045
Thomas Licona

Regional Enrichment Center
1819 E. Milham Avenue
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49003
Warren Lawrence

Rhode Island Teacher Center (RITC)
Rhode Island Department of
Education
25 Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908
Kenneth P. Mellor

Scarsdale Teaching Institute
Scarsdale High School
Post Road
Scarsdale, New York 10583
Werner Feig

Site Project
Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
1367 E. 6th
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Edward Fox

Syracuse University--West Genessee
Teaching Center
Stonehedge School
Camillus, New York 13031
Christine San Jose

The Teacher Center
425 College Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511
Corinne Levin

The Teacher Center
460 Talbot Avenue
Dorchester, Massachusetts 02144

Teacher Education Center
University of Cincinnati
230 E. 9th Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Ruth Wernersbach

Teacher Education Renewal Program
Maine School Administrative
District #3
Unity, Maine 04988
David Dey

Teacher Preparation Program
West Virginia State Department
of Education
Charleston, West Virginia 25311
Phil Suiter

The Teacher Works
2136 N.E. 20th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97212
Trudy Johnson/David Mesirow

Teachers Active Learning Center
San Francisco State College Faculty
Research and Projects
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132

Teachers, Inc.
2700 Broadway
New York, New York 10025
James Wiley

Teachers' Learning Center
San Francisco Public Schools
San Francisco, California 94101
Betty McNamara

Texas Center for the Improvement
of Educational Systems
6404 Tracor Lane
Austin, Texas 78721
Kyle Killough

University of Maryland, Baltimore
Campus, Teacher Education Centers
Catonsville, Maryland 21228
David Young

University of North Dakota
Center for Teaching & Learning
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201
Ivan Dahl

The Wednesday Program
P.O. Box 711
Princeton Regional Schools
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Kathleen Deben

Workshop Center for Open Education
Department of Education
City College
New York, New York 10010
Lilian Weber

Workshop for Learning Things
5 Bridge Street
Watertown, Massachusetts 02172
John Merrill

A Working Bibliography*

Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes. Inventory of Training Centers. Final Report. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University, Training Complex Project Administration Center, June 1970. ED 042 664. 64 pp. MF & HC.

Asher, James J. In-service Education: Psychological Perspectives. Berkeley: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, December 1967. ED 015 891. 80 pp. MF & HC.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Crises in Teacher Education: A Dynamic Response to AACTE's Future Role. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1971. ED 050 014. 25 pp. MF & HC.

---. Freedom with Responsibility in Teacher Education. 17th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1964.

Bailey, Stephen K. "Models from Abroad." Paper presented at the Teacher Center Conference (Syracuse, New York, 13-14 April 1972).

---. "Teacher Centers: A British First." Phi Delta Kappan 53, no. 3 (November 1971): 146-49. EJ 045 595.

Berty, Ernest. Evaluation Report of the Teacher Education Centers in West Virginia. Charleston: West Virginia State Department of Education, 1973. ED 080 604. 57 pp. MF & HC.

Bosley, Howard E., ed. An Experiment in Change. Teacher Education in Transition, vol. I. Baltimore, Md.: Multi-State Teacher Education Project, May 1969. ED 033 883. 354 pp. MF & HC.

Broudy, Harry S. The Real World of the Public Schools. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972. ED 075 984. 271 pp. Available only from the publisher.

Budig, Gene A., and Stanley G. Rives. Academic Quicksand; Some Trends and Issues in Higher Education. Lincoln, Nebr.: Professional Educators Publications, 1973.

---

* The largest omission of citations are those for publications from local centers. Including them would expand this bibliography to over 50 pages, so the authors chose to include only a representative sample of local center case studies. Moreover, because publications from local centers relate most closely to real centering problems, they are probably the most important references. To obtain current information from these places, it is recommended that the reader write directly to some of the specific centers listed on pages 38-41.

Burdin, Joel L. "Scenario on Teacher Centers in the 1990's." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 40-43.

Burns, W. J., and others. Teacher Education Centers: Do They Help Student Teachers Attain Their Learning Goals? Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, November 1973. ED 084 257. 37 pp. MF & HC.

Burton, Mary Kennedy, ed. CEDaR Catalog of Selected Educational Research and Development Programs and Products. 4th ed. Vol. I. Washington, D.C.: Council for Educational Development and Research, April 1974. ED 091 383. 410 pp. MF & HC. Also available from Commercial Educational Distributing Service, P. O. Box 3711, Portland, Oregon 97208.

---, ed. CEDaR Catalog of Selected Educational Research and Development Programs and Products. 4th ed. Vol. II. Washington, D.C.: Council for Educational Development and Research, April 1974. ED 091 384. 226 pp. MF & HC. Also available from Commercial Educational Distributing Service, P. O. Box 3711, Portland, Oregon 97208.

Campbell, Clyde M. "School-Community Councils." The Community School and Its Administration 11, no. 6 (February 1973): 1-4 [entire issue].

Central Advisory Council for Education. Children and Their Primary Schools [The "Plowden Report"]. A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967. ED 056 390. Available only from Pendragon House, Inc., 899 Broadway Avenue, Redwood City, California 94063 or HMSO, 49 High Holborn, London WC1, England.

Chase, Donald J. "How about a Teacher Education Center? . . . Ask the Kids." ED 087 733. 12 pp. MF & HC.

Clark, Christopher M. "Now That You Have a Teacher Center, What Are You Going To Put into It?" Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 46-48.

Cleveland, Ohio Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. Realities and Revolution in Teacher Education. Report No. 6. Cleveland: the Commission, November 1972. ED 072 028. 79 pp. MF only.

Cohen, Saul B. "A Five-Year Goal for Training Complexes." Appendix D of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education, by Benjamin Rosner and others.

---, and Mitchell Lichtenberg. Final Report of the Ad Hoc National Committee on Training Complexes. Worcester, Mass: Clark University, July 1970. ED 042 665. 171 pp. MF & HC.

Collins, James F. "The Making of a Teacher Center." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 13-20.

---. "The Teacher Education Center Concept. A Unifying Approach to Teacher Education." Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1970 ED 046 901. 63 slides plus 8-page printed narrative. Available only from the author.

---, in collaboration with Stephen K. Bailey. "Teacher Centers and Teacher Renewal." Paper prepared for the National Association of Sta of State Boards of Education, March 1972.

Cooke, W. R. "Mercer County Teacher Education Center." Princeton, W. Va.: Mercer County Public Schools [n.d.]. ED 046 868. 30 pp. MF & HC.

Council of the Great City Schools. "Toward a Definition of 'Portal Schools'." Portal Schools 1, no. 3 (January 1972): 1-4 ([e Councils's 1918 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.)

Crosby, J. Michael. "A Teacher Looks at Teaching Centers and Educational Reform." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 31-36.

Denemark, George W. "Teacher Education: Repair, Reform, or Revolution?" Editorial in Educational Leadership 26, no. 6 (March 1970).

---, and Joost Yff, eds. Obligation for Reform. The Final Report and Recommendations of the Higher Education National Field Task Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1974. ED 087 744. 75 pp. MF & HC.

Department of Education and Science. Teacher Education and Training. [The "James Report"]. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1972. ED 065 449. Available from Pendragon House, 899 Broadway Avenue, Redwood City, California 94063.

DeVault, M. Vere. "Teacher Centers: An International Concept." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 37-39.

---. Teacher Centers in Japan, England, and the United States. A Series of Case Studies. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1973. Ed number will appear in November 1974 issue of Research in Education. 129 pp. MF & HC.

Dickson, George E., ed. Planning a Prototype Teacher Center for Ohio. Toledo, Ohio: University of Toledo, College of Education, June 1972. ED 086 677. 73 pp. MF & HC.

---, and others. Partners for Educational Reform and Renewal. Toledo, Ohio: University of Toledo, College of Education, November 1973. ED 087 716. 50 pp. MF & HC.

Dunkin, M. J., and B. J. Biddle. The Study of Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Durant, Freddie A. "The Feasibility of Using Community Representatives in the Design and Installation of Teacher Centers." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, 1971.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "The Reform of Education and Teacher Education: A Complex Task." Journal of Teacher Education 23, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 117-25. EJ 064 609.

Fisher, Stephen J., and Roland J. Goddu. Student Teaching Centers: A Pilot Project. Cambridge, Mass.: Harrand University, Center for Research and Development, 1962. ED 088 824. 29 pp. MF & HC.

Flowers, John, and others. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948. Out of print.

Ford, Richard B. "Teacher Centers in England: A Brief Reaction." Prepared for Task Force '72. Washington, D.C. U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, 1972.

Futchs, Mariya. "Shared Responsibility: A Special Study on One Structural Feature of Teacher Centers." Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1971.

Galler, Wayne H., and Myrna M. Taney. Benefits Accruing for the Teaching Profession via University-Public School Partnership. Normal: Illinois State University, College of Education, 1974. ED 088 817. 22 pp. MF & HC.

Hagge, Lauren, and others. A Summary Report on the Teacher Center Conference Held at Steven's Point Wisconsin, December 1-2 1972. Madison: The Wisconsin Improvement Program, 1973.

Havelock, Ronald G. Training for Change Agents. A Guide to the Design of Training Programs in Education and Other Fields. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1971. ED 056 259. 219 pp. MF & HC.

---, and Mary C. Havelock. Preparing Knowledge Linking Change Agents in Education. A Materials and Training Development Project. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1971. ED 056 257. 90 pp. MF & HC.

Hite, Herbert. The WWSC Clinical Program for Teacher Education. Seattle: Southeast Educational Center; Bellingham: Western Washington State College, College of Education, April 1971. ED 056 973. 17 pp. MF & HC.

Houston, W. Robert, and others. Restructuring Teacher Education. A Report of the Rationale, Objectives, and Activities of the Houston Teacher Center, 1970-1973. Houston, Tex.: University of Houston, College of Education, 1973. ED 085 334. 312 pp. MF & HC.

Houston, W. Robert, and others, eds. Resources for Performance-Based Education. Albany: New York State Education Department and Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, 1973. ED 076 555. 245 pp. MF & HC.

Howey, Kenneth R. "Comprehensive Renewal in the Public Schools: The Context and Potential of Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 26-30.

---. "Teacher Centers- Is There Anything New? Some Tentative Guidelines for Assessing the Nature and Extent of Collaboration and Renewal." Paper prepared for the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, 15-19 April 1974). ED 090 148. 8 pp. MF & HC.

Hyer, Anna, and others. Teacher Centers: Involvement of the United Teaching Profession. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1972.

Indiana University at New Albany, College of Education. A Composite Field Based Performance Program with an "Adopt-A-School" Component. New Albany: the College, 1973. ED 087 717. 33 pp. MF & HC.

Inside-Out. The Final Report and Recommendations of the Teachers National Field Task Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1974. ED 093 863. 58 pp. MF & HC.

Joyce, Bruce R. "The Promise of Performance (Competency) Based Teacher Education: An Analytical Review of the Literature and Experience." September 1971. ED 083 147. 292 pp. MF & HC. Summarized in Literature Searches of Major Issues on Educational Reform, compiled by Allen Schmieder.

---, and Marsha Weil. Concepts of Teacher Centers. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1973. ED 075 375. 29 pp. MF & HC.

Judson, Madison. "Teacher Centers (A Poem)." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 44-46.

Kaplan, Leonard. "Survival Talk for Educators--on Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 49-51.

Kiesling, Herbert J. "Measuring a Local Government Service, A Study of School Districts in New York State." Review of Economics and Statistics 49 (August 1967): 356-67.

Koch, Mary B. "The Learning Center: A Collaborating Model for Educational Development 1972." ED 080 455. 66 pp. MF & HC.

Kovert, Robert, and J. Duane Radzikowski. The Center for Educational Advancement. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: Second Annual Report, vol. V. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, August 1974.

---. The Rhode Island Teacher Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: Second Annual Report, vol. III. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, August 1974.

Kovert, Robert, and Jane Siegel. The Bay Area Learning Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: Second Annual Report, vol. II. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, August 1974.

---. The Texas Teacher Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: Second Annual Report, vol. IV. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, August 1974.

Kroner, Francine B., and David E. O'Gorman. A Workshop Kit for Stimulating Involvement in the Development of Teacher Education Centers. Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, August 1972. ED 068 446. 10 pp. MF & HC.

LaFaver, Harold D. "In-Service Training and Professional Development via a Teacher Centre." Catalyst for Change 3, no. 2 (Winter 1974): 7-10.

Leonard, Albert J. "Teacher Centers: Where Do They Come from and Why?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, 15-19 April 1974). ED 090 204. 11 pp. MF & HC.

Lickona, Thomas, and others, eds. "Open Education: Increasing Alternatives for Teachers and Children. Proceedings of the Conference on Open Education, April, 1972." Educational Alternatives: A Source Book 1, nos. 1 and 2 (Spring-Fall 1973). ED 080 451. 258 pp. MF & HC.

Louis, Karen Seashore, and Sam D. Sieber. Field Agents Role in Education. USOE Pilot State Dissemination Program. Pt. 1. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, January 1972. ED 056 254. 41 pp. MF & HC.

Lutonsky, Linda, ed. Portal Schools. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Council of the Great City Schools, 1973. ED 082 283. 77 pp. MF & HC. Available free from the Council, 1707 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Maddox, Kathryn. In West Virginia, It Is Working. One Teacher Education Center in Action. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1973. ED 086 679. 64 pp. MF & HC. Available for $2.00 from the Association, Number One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

---. "A Model for a Multi-Institutional Teacher Education Center." Paper prepared for the Conference on Teacher Centers (Stevens Point, Wisconsin, 1-2 December 1972).

Mallan, John T. "Teaching Centers: Utopia, Eutopia, or Kakotipia?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, Illinois, February 1974). ED 087 779. 13 pp. MF & HC.

Marsh, David. "An Explication of Issues surrounding Teacher Centers and Education Renewal Sites." Paper prepared for the Leadership Training Institute for Educational Personnel Development (University of South Florida, Tampa, 1972). ED 086 678. 58 pp. MF & HC.

---. "Issues Concerning Teacher Centers: Research and Development--Is There a Role?" Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, 15-19 April 1974). ED 093 834. 9 pp. MF & HC.

Mohr, Paul. "Current Research and Development Efforts in Insurance Training and Curriculum Planning for Teacher Education." 1971. ED 083 148. 161 pp. MF & HC. Summarized in Literature Searches of Major Issues on Educational Reform, compiled by Allen Schmieder.

Merrit, Daniel L., and Evelyn Belle. "The Teaching Education Center Is Alive and Well." Journal of Teacher Education 23, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 152-54.

Miller, Starr, and John Hulsey. "Which Direction for Schools of Education?" 1971. ED 087 763. 10 pp. MF & HC.

Ministry of Education. Basic Guidelines for the Reform of Education. Tokyo: the Ministry, 1972.

---. Education in Japan. Tokyo: the Ministry, 1971.

National Education Association. Report of the NEA Task Force on Practitioner Involvement in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1973.

National Education Association, Instruction and Professional Development, Teacher Center Project Team. NEA Teacher Center Network; A Prospectus. Washington, D.C.: Instruction and Professional Development, December 1972. ED 079 231. 24 pp. MF & HC.

---. A Report on the NEA Teacher Center Program. Washington, D.C.: Instruction and Professional Development, 1973.

National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. A New Order in Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: the Commission, 1967.

---. Who's in Charge Here? Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: the Commission, 1966.

National Union of Teachers. Teachers' Centres: A Survey of Centre Resources and Conditions of Service of Leaders. London: the Union, 1972.

Olson, Paul A., and others, eds. Education for 1984 and After. A Symposium of Deans of Education and Leaders in Institutions Educating Teachers. Lincoln, Nebr.: Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1971. ED 061 149. 238 pp. MF & HC.

---, and others, eds. The University Can't Train Teachers: A Symposium of School Administrators Discuss School-Based Undergraduate Education of Teachers. Lincoln, Nebr.: Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, June 1972. ED 066 425. 171 pp. MF & HC.

Parsons, Theodore W. "Developing a Teacher Center." October 1972. ED 086 673. 19 pp. MF & HC.

Peeler, Thomas H., and Jerome R. Shapiro. "A Focus on the Cooperative Reorganization of Pre-service and In-service Teacher Education Programs." 1971. ED 081 764. 120 pp. MF & HC. Summarized in Literature Searches of Major Issues on Educational Reform, compiled by Allen Schmieder.

Peper, John B. The Texas Teacher Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: A Status Report, vol. IV. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, March 1973.

---. The Texas Teacher Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: The Annual Report, vol. IV. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, June 1973.

Pitcher, Paul S. "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Phi Delta Kappan 54, no. 5 (January 1973): 340-43.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Opening Up the View." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 52-58.

---. Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, May 1972. ED 062 302. 35 pp. MF & HC.

Price, Shelby L., and John H. Baker. "A New Dimension to the Teacher Center Concept: A University Partnership with a Community College." 1973. ED 087 756. 10 pp. MF & HC.

Provus, Malcolm, and Jane Siegel. The Rhode Island Teacher Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: The Annual Report, vol. III. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, June 1973.

Provus, Malcolm, and others. The Four Teacher Center Pilots. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: A Status Report, vol. I. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, March 1973.

---. The Four Teacher Center Pilots. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: Second Annual Report, vol. I. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, August 1974.

---. The Four Teacher Center Pilots. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: The Annual Report, vol. I. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, June 1973.

Raskin, Bruce. "Teachers Helping Teachers." Learning 2, no. 1 (September 1973): 29-30.

Reinish, Jim, ed. Teacher Training. [Newsletter for U. S. Office of Education Teacher Training Complexes/Centers] 1, nos. 1, 2, and 3 (Fall 1971, Winter 1972, Spring 1972). Available from Jim Reinish, editor, The Stony Brook Teacher Training Complex, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Richey, Herman G. "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-service Education." In In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, edited by Henry B. Nelson. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1957.

Rosenshine, Barak. Teacher Behaviours and Student Achievement. London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1971.

Rosner, Benjamin. "The British Teacher Center: A Report on Its Development, Current Operations, Effects, and Applicability to Teacher Education in the U.S." November 1972. ED 090 165. 34 pp. MF & HC.

---. "Notes on a School-University Consortium for Teacher Education." Appendix F of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education, by Benjamin Rosner and others.

---, and others. The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972. ED 063 238. Available only from the publisher.

Rubin, Louis J., ed. Improving In-service Education: Proposals and Perspectives for Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971. ED 052 154. Available only from the publisher.

Ruchkin, Judith P. "Teacher Centers: How Does One School-College Collaborator Work?" Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 2 (Summer 1974): 170-74.

Sagan, Edgar L., and Barbara G. Smith. Alternative Models for the Co-Operative Governance of Teacher Education Programs. Lincoln, Nebr.: Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, April 1973. ED 087 773. 100 pp. MF & HC.

San Francisco State University, College of Education. Pilot Program: San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development. San Francisco, Calif.: the College, 1973. ED 085 386. 17 pp. MF & HC.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Schalock, H. Del. "BEPD, NCERD, and Teacher Education That Makes a Demonstrable Difference." Appendix G of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education, by Benjamin Rosner and others.

Schmieder, Allen. Reformese Jargon: The Language and Literature of Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, January 1973. ED 073 044. 81 pp. MF & HC.

---. "Teacher Centering in America." In Teacher Centers in Japan, England, and the United States, edited by M. Vere DeVault.

---. "Teacher Centers: A Brief History." Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, 1972.

---, comp. Literature Searches of Major Issues on Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974. ED 090 144. 280 pp. MF & HC.

---, and Stephen Holowenzak. "Consortia." In Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems and Prospects, edited by W. Robert Houston and Robert Howsam. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972. ED 074 017. Available only from the publisher.

---, and Jorie Mark. "The National Storehouse of Educational Materials/ Successes: Some Summary Materials." Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, Office of Career Education, Division of Educational Systems Development, 1974.

---, and Sam J. Yarger. "Teacher/Teaching Centering in America." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 5-12.

Schools Council. List of Teachers' Centres and Works in England. London: the Council, 1973.

---. Teachers' Centres and the Changing Curriculum: A Report of Three National Conferences. London: the Council, 1971.

Selden, David. "Teachers Centers: Who Should Pay and Who Should Control?" Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, 15-19 April 1974). ED 090 168. 4 pp. MF & HC.

Sentz, Erma I., and Floyd Perry. Teacher Education Centers: The CMTEC Centers. St. Cloud: Central Minnesota Teacher Education Council, October 1973. ED 081 720. 10 pp. MF & HC.

Shanker, Albert. "The 'Teacher Center': A Major Educational Advance." The New York Times, 26 December 1971.

Siegel, Jane. The Bay Area Learning Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: The Annual Report, vol. II. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, June 1973.

---. The Center for Educational Advancement. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: A Status Report, vol. V. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, March 1973.

---. The Center for Educational Advancement. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: The Annual Report, vol. V. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, June 1973.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

Smith, E. Brooks. Putting Curriculum Development and Inservice Education Together, Results: Professionalization of the Teacher and Continuous School Curriculum and Instructional Improvement. Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State University, College of Education, 1973.

---, and others, eds. Partnership in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association for Student Teaching, 1968. ED 022 726. 307 pp. MF only. Available from the publishers in book form.

---, and others. "Cooperative Education between an Urban School System and an Urban University: A Process Approach to the Development of Teaching Centers." Detroit, Mich: Wayne State University, College of Education, 1972.

Smith, Emmitt. "The State of the States in Teacher Centering." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974): 21-25.

Smith, William. "Performance-Based Teacher Education: First Steps First." In Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems and Prospects, edited by W. Robert Houston and Robert Howsam. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972. ED 074 017. Available only from the publisher.

Smith, B. Othanel, and others. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969. ED 027 267. 188 pp. MF & HC.

Sobol, Francis T. "What Variables Appear Important in Changing Traditional In-Service Training Procedures?" November 1971. ED 083 146. 45 pp. MF & HC. Summarized in Literature Searches of Major Issues on Educational Reform, compiled by Allen Schmieder.

Steinmetz, Andres, and Jane Siegel. The Bay Area Learning Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: A Status Report, vol. II. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, March 1973.

Stewart, Charles E. "Facilitating Local Options and Coordination of Programs." Appendix H of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education, by Benjamin Rosner and others.

Tanenberg, M. S. Creating Curriculum for Teacher Centers: Inventing the Teacher Center Came. Haywood: California State University at Haywood, 1973.

Tanner, James, and George W. Denemark. "The Focus of the Teacher Center in an Educational Renewal Site." Draft IV. February 1972. ED 086 675. 13 pp. MF & HC.

The Teacher Education Center Act. Senate Bill 622, Florida State Legislature, 1973.

Transgard, David T., ed. Six Crucial Issues in Education. Denver, Colo.: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1972. ED 077 072. 110 pp. MF & HC.

Tyler, Ralph W. "In-service Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and Future," In Improving In-service Education. Proposals and Perspectives for Change, edited by Louis J. Rubin.

U. S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

University of Minnesota and Minneapolis Public Schools. An Overview of Alternative Education: Implications for a Teacher Center Model. Minneapolis: the University and the Schools, February 1974. ED 088 896. 6 pp. MF & HC.

Walling, Willoughby, and Jane Siegel. The Rhode Island Teacher Center. Evaluating the Four Teacher Center Pilots: A Status Report, vol. III. Charlottesville, Va.: Evaluation Research Center, March 1973.

West Virginia State Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. Teacher Education Center Survey. Region V, West Central West Virginia. Charleston: the Bureau, May 1973. ED 083 253. 39 pp. MF & HC.

Wisconsin State University. University of Wisconsin-River Falls Renewal Programs. River Falls: the University, November 1973. ED 085 375. 8 pp. MF & HC.

Woodruff, Philip. "British Primary Education--Components of Innovation." August 1971. ED 081 765. 134 pp. MF & HC. Summarized in Literature Searches of Major Issues on Educational Reform, compiled by Allen Schmieder.

---. "Task Force '72 and the Classroom Teacher Look at Educational Reform." Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, 1972.

Yarger, Sam J. "The Future--Do Teacher Centers Have One?" Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, 15-19 April 1974). ED 090 219. 9 pp. MF & HC.

---. "Teacher/Teaching Centers and PBTE--Some Questions." Paper delivered at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Leadership Training Institute in Performance-Based Teacher Education (St. Louis, Missouri, 1974).

---. "A Tool for the Analysis of Teacher Centers in American Education--A Working Paper." 1973. ED 086 676. 21 pp. MF & HC.

---, and Albert J. Leonard. A Descriptive Study of the Teacher Center Movement in American Education. Sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education Teacher Corps and the Office of Career Education. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, College of Education, 1974.

ABOUT ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system established by the U.S. Office of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published and unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the U.S. Office of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training funds, and general services to the clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators; and Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

> *The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; the profession of teaching; and the fields of health, physical education, and recreation. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is professional preparation and practice in America, it also is interested in international aspects of the field.*

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with pre- and in-service preparation of school personnel and the profession of teaching.

FURTHER RESEARCH

You may do further research on this topic by checking issues of Research in Education (RIE) and Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE). Both RIE and CIJE use the same descriptors (index terms). Documents in RIE are listed in blocks according to the clearinghouse code letters which processed them, beginning with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Career Education (CE) and ending with the ERIC Clearinghouse on the Disadvantaged (UD). The clearinghouse code letters, which are listed at the beginning of RIE, appear opposite the ED number at the beginning of each entry. "SP" (School Personnel) designates documents processed by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. For readers uncertain how to use ERIC capabilities effectively, we recommend How To Conduct a Search Through ERIC, ED 036 499, microfiche $.75; hardcopy $1.85. It is available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.